

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3, 6, 17, 21, 22, and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been submitted.

The above claim amendments do not change the scope or breadth of the claims, but rather merely attempt to clarify the previously claimed concurrent operation of the one-way communication through the handset during the two-way communication, for example.

Claims 1-23 are pending and under consideration.

OFFICE ACTION REQUEST FOR SUPPORT

On page 9 of the Office Action the Examiner requests applicant provide a working demonstration of speakerphone where both the handset and the speaker are performing the same conversation simultaneously. Here, it is believed that the Examiner is asking applicants to provide support in the specification for the claimed simultaneous operation of the two way communication through the handset and the one way communication through the speaker. The present application provides such support for applicants' invention.

In this regard, applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the present specification where particularly examples of a handset (speaker and microphone) are performing a two-way communication operation and a separate speaker is used for a one-way communication, such that the same conversation is heard through both the handset and the speaker, but only the handset can provide the two-way communication, e.g., through the microphone of the handset.

As only an example, see paragraph [0023] of the present application, "[t]he handset 20 is mounted on a body of the communication apparatus, and includes a speaker part for allowing a user to communicate with another party. When the handset 20 is taken off-hook by the user, the transmit-receive line is opened so that the voice signal and the dial tone are transmitted/received," and paragraph [0026], "[t]he speakerphone includes the one-way speakerphone function. The one-way speakerphone function allows a third party around the user to hear the conversation between the user and the opposite party while the user is using the hand set 20. When the one-way speakerphone function selection key signal is input, a speaker line is opened along with the transmit-receive line of the handset 20 being opened, so that a transmit-receive signal flowing through the handset 20 is also output through the speaker."

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the present application clearly provides support of the claimed concurrent operation of the two-way communication with the handset at the same time as the one-way communication with the speaker, for example.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §102

Claims 1-12 and 15-23 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Lipton et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,991,398. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants again respectfully submit that Lipton et al. fails to disclose or suggest the claimed concurrent operation of the two-way communication operation and the one-way communication operation as well as the selective activation of the one-way communication after a dialing operation has been completed, noting that all or some of the same is set forth with differing scope and breadth in the different independent claims.

This concurrent operation and as-claimed delay in starting a one-way communication until after a dialing has been completed was previously discussed by applicant as a differentiating reason between the claimed invention and any potential obviousness or anticipation for the relied upon references. As claimed, the one-way communication is provided by outputting a conversation signal to the speaker when the handset is already off-hook, the one-way speakerphone operation selection key signal is selected, and the dialing has been completed.

The present inventors have addressed a found problem of speakerphone operations of a "howling" phenomenon that is generated is the one-way communication through the speaker is operated while the dialing of the two-way communication is being implemented. As previously noted, the relied upon reference merely relates to the providing of communication using a plurality of phone lines and handsets, which is unrelated to the claimed concurrent operation and delayed operation of the one-way communication, as well as the present application disclosed howling phenomenon.

Regardless, for such a concurrent operation, the Office Action appears to rely upon col. 4, lines 53-65, of Lipton et al. to disclose this concurrent operation.

However, this portion of Lipton et al. merely sets forth in a third speakerphone mode, when a user presses the hook rapidly for a flash signal the handset is decoupled from the communication on the first telephone line, then the speaker is coupled to the first telephone line, and the handset is coupled to the second telephone line and a user can initiate a dialing sequence through this second telephone line. Here, the operation starts with the user using the

handset, but after the flash signal the conversation with the first telephone line is placed in a passive mode and the user can use handset with the second telephone line.

At no time within Lipton et al. is the same conversation available through the handset and the speaker.

In the first speakerphone mode, Lipton et al. indicates that a user can dial a phone number using the speaker of the speakerphone or for answering an incoming call, with the speakerphone speaker and microphone being coupled to the first telephone line and maintains the handset speaker and microphone to be uncoupled from any telephone line.

In the second speakerphone mode, Lipton et al. the user can make a call with the handset through a second telephone line while the speakerphone speaker and microphone are coupled to the first telephone line. Here, the operation begins with the user using the speakerphone on the first telephone line, but then the conversation in the first telephone line can be placed in a passive mode, so the user can talk on the handset with the second telephone line.

Again, at no time is the same conversation concurrently available through the handset and the speaker.

In addition, using claim 1 as an example, the Office Action has again indicated that, regarding the "the dialing having been completed of the claimed "a conversation signal is transmitted through the speaker concurrently with the two-way communication operation in response to the handset being off-hook, the one-way speakerphone operation selection key signal being input, and the dialing having being completed," is inherent in a speakerphone set.

However, Lipton et al. fails to disclose or suggest such a "in response to" feature, of the conversation signal being transmitted "in response to": a) the handset being off-hook; b) the one-way speakerphone operation selection key signal being input; and c) the dialing having been completed.

Some conversation may be switched to the speakerphone speaker of Lipton et al. after some dialing, but that switching would not be performed with all of the handset being off-hook (e.g., enabled and coupled to a telephone line), the one-way speakerphone key being set, and the dialing having been completed. Here, "the dialing" requires this dialing to be the same dialing previously claimed in claim 1.

These three requirements are never all met by Lipton et al., and thus the "in response" feature of claim 1 also cannot be met.

All independent claims include some form of the aforementioned concurrently required operation of the two-way communication and the one-way communication. Lipton et al. fails to disclose this operation or the claimed corresponding interrelationship between the operation of the speaker and the handset or the corresponding interrelationship between the operations of two-way communication and the one-way communication.

Lipton et al. provides no discussion or suggestion of linking any operation of the speaker of the speakerphone with the operation of the handset, or vice versa. The operation of the speaker in Lipton et al. is merely for the conventional operation of a speakerphone speaker separate from the operation of the handset.

Lastly, Lipton et al. further fails to provide any reason why the speaker of a speakerphone would not be coupled to the same telephone line the user is using for the handset until the dialing is complete. Only the present application provides a reason for the same, i.e., to avoid feedback with both the speakerphone speaker and handset are enabled and a dial tone is output. The presently claimed invention can avoid such howling. See paragraph [0006] of the present application.

Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §103

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipton et al., and further in view of Parks et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,877,746. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Parks et al. similarly fails to disclose or suggest the deficient features of Lipton et al.

Withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/644,931

Docket No.: 1349.1271

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Date: 2/21/08

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By: 

Stephen T. Boughner
Registration No. 45,317

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501